

Articles

All papers in the Articles section are peer reviewed and discuss the latest research in journalism and journalism education. These are intended to inform, educate and spark debate and discussion. Please join in this debate by going to www.journalism-education.org to have your say and find out what others think.

The struggle over news literacy: can we include political economic contexts in the emerging field of news literacy?

Seth Ashley, Boise State University

ABSTRACT: Surging in popularity, news literacy has tended to centre on an understanding of journalistic content and its importance for preserving democratic life. What typically receive less attention are the political, economic and cultural contexts in which news is produced. A focus on content is warranted, but examination of the institutions and structure of news media systems also is essential for developing a full appreciation of the strengths and weaknesses of news content. Drawing on literature in media literacy, political economy of media, and media sociology, this paper argues for a context-centred approach to the critical analysis of news content as well as its production and consumption.

The nascent domain of news literacy has tended to centre on an understanding of journalistic content and its importance for preserving democratic life. When viewed in isolation, news literacy is about exporting the journalistic epistemology to ordinary citizens struggling to navigate daily life: checking facts, evaluating sources, examining evidence.

Considering the messiness of the digital media landscape, who wouldn't want to train citizens in the ways of the journalist? The information-gathering skills practiced by hard-nosed reporters are vital in the digital age and are surely in need of widespread dissemination. Citizens are better poised to navigate the media landscape in general and the news landscape in particular with these tools of thought and analysis.

But literacy means more than this. Particularly when news literacy is considered in the context of longstanding domains of media literacy and civic literacy, it becomes clear that critical analysis of the information environment requires a deeper understanding of the contexts in which news is produced. The purpose of this article is to advocate for a critical, contextual approach to news literacy that can supplement the increasingly popular content-based approach. Drawing on literature in critical media literacy, political economy of media, and media sociology, this article reviews the connections that must be made and the contexts that must be considered in order to critically analyze news content as well as its production and consumption.

This is not a new question in the context of media literacy, where scholars have long debated the role of political, economic and social contexts in media education (see Hobbs 1998; Lewis and Jhally 1998; Kellner and Share 2005). News literacy thus far has tended to be viewed as an isolated educational endeavour, where a few early adopters and powerful funders have gained significant traction with their particular approach. For the field of news literacy to gain the widespread acceptance it seeks and deserves, the field must be considered in the context of the umbrella discipline of media literacy. It is important to situate this burgeoning area in terms of existing academic literature and debate.

There are many open questions about how to define and teach news literacy, and this article focuses on the topic of political, economic and social contexts. Some educators and practitioners have dismissed or neglected these connections (see Jolly 2014; Key Concepts of News Literacy 2015; Kovach and Rosenstiel 2010), but we must have an honest and open consideration of the role of contexts if news literacy is going to legitimise itself as an area worthy of serious study and attention. A decision to omit these contexts from consideration is just as value-laden as a decision to include them, so we need to account for these different values and consider their role in creating an informed and engaged citizenry, which is surely our broadly shared goal.

As Lewis and Jhally wrote regarding media literacy in 1998:

“we are advocating a view that recognizes that the world is always made by someone, and a decision to tolerate the status quo is as political as a more overtly radical act” (Lewis and Jhally 1998, 119).

Accepting the world as it is runs contrary to the purpose of critical thought, which is to question and challenge and - when necessary - to change. It is a fundamental problem with our depoliticized cultures if we pretend to discuss and understand news media messages without discussing the contexts and structures that produce them. Indeed, tolerating the status quo - or worse, altogether ignoring that there is a status quo - is a failure to recognize a fundamental truth about reality and a missed opportunity to engage our students in the world they seek to know.

What the content-centred approach misses

In their 2010 book *Blur: How to Know What's True in the Age of Information Overload*, journalism populists Bill Kovach and Tom Rosenstiel call for the introduction of civic and news literacy into middle and high school curricula in order to improve the skills of citizens. They go out of their way to distinguish news literacy from media literacy, dismissing an entire discipline in one fell swoop:

"And by "news literacy," we mean something different from "media literacy," a curriculum developed mostly from a left-leaning perspective that teaches how the media in all its forms manipulates us on behalf of commercial and establishment interests. By "news literacy," we mean the skills of how to "read" the news - the discipline of skeptical knowing." (Kovach and Rosenstiel 2010, 202)

This framing is frustrating for many reasons. First of all, this is a fundamental misunderstanding of media literacy, which seeks broadly to empower individuals to question media content and institutions based on a holistic understanding of the media landscape. Media literacy education aims to make individuals aware of their media environments and increase critical thinking about media's constructions of reality. Broadly, media literacy can be defined as "the ability to access, analyze, evaluate and communicate" a variety of media messages (Aufderheide and Firestone 1993; Hobbs 2008). More to the point, Christ and Potter (1998) note that media literacy is "more than just the development of certain skills, but also the acquisition of knowledge structures, especially about the media industries, general content patterns, and a broad view of effects" (8). To ignore these contexts is to see only part of the picture.

Kovach and Rosenstiel take a content-centred approach to news literacy as they emphasize the "skills of how to 'read' the news." In their book, they encourage a "skeptical way of knowing" based on six questions:

"What kind of content am I encountering?

Is the information complete; and if not, what is missing?

Who or what are the sources, and why should I believe them?

What evidence is presented, and how was it tested or vetted?

What might be an alternative explanation or understanding?

Am I learning what I need to?" (Kovach and Rosenstiel 2010, 32)

To be clear, these are great questions, and a great starting point. In *Blur*, the authors build on their previous work in *The Elements of Journalism: What Newspeople Should Know and the Public Should Expect* (2007), which also aims to transfer to the public the knowledge and skills possessed by good journalists to aid understanding of news messages. The path forward for news literacy is to pair these skills and tools embodied in the content-centred approach with the broader contexts that have long been central to media literacy education.

For most people, news media can offer a key connection to civic life. Anyone who cares about news literacy surely believes in the potential of news to help meet the needs of a democratic society. But it is no secret that news media occasionally miss the mark and provide incomplete or inaccurate portrayals. The "skeptical way of knowing" is a good start but is not sufficient for identifying systemic weaknesses and shortcomings. Any U.S. election cycle demonstrates the need for a contextual approach to understanding the news. Election coverage is typically dominated by image-based narratives and horse-race mentality, with a dearth of attention paid to issues or policies. When nations engage in international conflict, news messages often take an ethnocentric flavor, ignoring conflicting points of view. The U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003 demonstrated the difficulty of challenging official perspectives even when conflicting evidence was available. News media offered no

warnings of the financial collapse of 2008 and have demonstrated little desire for accountability in its aftermath. Despite overwhelming scientific evidence, news coverage of global warming has been notoriously two-sided, exemplifying the false balance that objectivity often promotes. The collapsing news business has opened up the search for new revenue streams, including the increasingly popular sponsored content and paid posts. For people who get news from social media outlets, algorithms govern what news will reach them in the first place.

These shortcomings related to news media are well documented in the academic literature and are born from the very structures, contexts, and institutions that create and deliver news (See Shoemaker and Reese 2013; Shoemaker and Vos 2009). Examining content alone does not help address or even identify any of these structural, contextual issues. A variety of approaches to studying media contexts, including such resilient theories as gatekeeping, framing and agenda-setting, have demonstrated the need for a contextual approach to understanding news media. Therefore, news literacy education must go beyond simple skill sets in order to evaluate the context in which news appears.

The context-centred approach

In a 1998 themed issue of the *Journal of Communication*, Lewis & Jhally wrote in *The Struggle Over Media Literacy* about the need for a contextual approach to media literacy education:

"Media literacy should be about helping people to become sophisticated citizens rather than sophisticated consumers. The mass media, in other words, should be understood as more than a collection of texts to be deconstructed and analyzed so that we can distinguish or choose among them. They should be analyzed as sets of institutions with particular social and economic structures that are neither inevitable nor irreversible. Media education should certainly teach students to engage media texts, but it should also, in our view, teach them to engage and challenge media institutions." (Lewis and Jhally 1998, 109)

Applied to news literacy, this critical approach opens up opportunities to invite students to see how and why news messages are made, to gain a better understanding of their strengths and weaknesses, and to engage as participants in the social construction of reality. This does not mean students are drawn to reach a certain conclusion or that it is acceptable to preach a narrow ideological perspective. It simply means that any kind of literacy is more meaningful if students are encouraged to see and ask questions about the bigger picture.

It is not surprising that the potential ideological implications of a critical approach are significant and are the subject of debate. As Renee Hobbs has suggested, "there is an obvious ideology that underlies even the most basic tenets of media literacy education - teaching students to question textual authority and to use reasoning to reach autonomous decisions. This agenda is radical enough, without adding additional baggage associated with other explicitly formulated political or social change objectives" (1998, 23). Indeed, there is a line to be drawn between educating students and propagandising to them. But a contextual approach is possible and essential, as it "allows students to see the media within a framework of interests and power relations" (Lewis and Jhally 1998, 117).

As a conceptual framework, Potter's cognitive model of media literacy (2004) is a helpful way to contextualize media messages and provide a holistic approach to news literacy. Potter says his model requires more "conscious processing of information" and "preparation for exposures" (68), and identifies five basic knowledge structures that facilitate information processing and meaning construction. These include media effects, media content, media industries, real world, and the self. Equipped with Potter's knowledge structures,

“people are much more aware during the information-processing tasks and are, therefore, more able to make better decisions about seeking out information, working with that information, and constructing meaning from it that will be useful to serve their own goals” (69). Taken together, these areas form a foundation for understanding the media environment broadly.

Tailored to news, these areas create an outline for what holistic news literacy education might look like. In my own research with colleagues (Maksl, Ashley and Craft 2015), Potter’s model has been adapted to news and used to create a news media literacy scale that helps define what a contextual approach to news literacy might look like and has proven useful as a way to gauge high and low levels of news literacy. In addition to helping to explicate the meaning of news literacy, this scale is a useful assessment tool that can be applied broadly across different educational environments and can be compared to other measures such as those related to civic and political knowledge and engagement.

A context-centred approach also has roots in political economy, which provides a helpful lens for viewing the relationship between media and power in society. The framework is useful for studying media because it encourages a critical approach to examining the interactions of media and power with a focus on the impact of these interactions. When well taught, it is an open and questioning approach that aims to provide a holistic view of the media landscape and invites students to draw their own conclusions based on their own critical thought and analysis. Robert McChesney (2008) offers this contemporary understanding of the political economy of media and its purpose as an analytical framework:

It is a field that endeavors to connect how media and communication systems and content are shaped by ownership, market structures, commercial support, technologies, labor practices, and government policies. The political economy of media then links the media and communications systems to how both economic and political systems work, and social power is exercised, in society. Specifically, in the United States and much of the world, what role do media and communication play in how capitalist economies function, and how do both media and capitalism together and separately influence the exercise of political power? The central question for media political economists is whether, on balance, the media system serves to promote or undermine democratic institutions and practices. (2008, 12)

Why is this critical approach useful and can it be taught in a way that allows students to draw their own conclusions? As Lewis and Jhally (1998) suggest, the goal of media literacy is to help people become sophisticated citizens rather than sophisticated consumers. Media literacy, they say, is “a way of extending democracy to the place where democracy is increasingly scripted and defined” (1998, 109). They continue:

“The mass media may be producing art, but they are also producing commerce. We feel that it is impossible to understand one fully without comprehending the other. Unlike some of the more public service-oriented broadcasting systems in Europe and elsewhere, the goals of a loosely regulated, commercial media have no educational, cultural, or informational imperatives. As much of the literature on the political economy of media suggests, they are there to maximize profits and to serve a set of corporate interests. These imperatives provide a framework that helps to shape both the form and content of media texts.” (1998, 110)

Media literacy, therefore, is more than a matter of basic comprehension. The skills needed to fully understand media content must also include the analysis of contexts. Lewis and Jhally write:

“Media literacy, in short, is about more than the analysis of messages, it is about an awareness of why those messages are there. It is not enough to know that they are pro-

duced, or even how, in a technical sense, they are produced. To appreciate the significance of contemporary media, we need to know why they are produced, under what constraints and conditions, and by whom.” (1998, 111)

As mentioned earlier, critics say this type of conceptualization is too radical or ideological for media education. But Lewis and Jhally emphasize that this is not their aim. Rather, they propose only to demonstrate to students the factors that influence media content so that students can draw their own conclusions. Failing to do so is effectively an embrace of dominant norms, which could be considered just as ideological as an attempt to challenge them. As Potter (2004) notes, the goal should not be to accept or to embrace any particular ideology but rather to embrace critical questioning so that individuals may be empowered to decide for themselves:

“I argue that rejection of the ideology is not the goal; the goal, instead, should be to allow people to appreciate parts of the ideology that are functional for them and create new perspectives where the ideology is not functional for them. That is, the choice should be up to the individual. Mindlessly rejecting the media ideology *in toto* is not much better than mindlessly accepting it *in toto*.” (2004, 57)

Understanding the ideology of media—especially news media—is key to interpreting and decoding media messages; but it should be left up to individuals to decide for themselves what conclusions they wish to draw. This is the essence of critical thinking.

Len Masterman, who is considered one of the forefathers of media literacy, suggests that this critical approach inevitably leads to improved citizenship and social change. In “A Rationale for Media Education,” he writes:

“The democratization of institutions, and the long march toward a truly participatory democracy, will be highly dependent upon the ability of majorities of citizens to take control, become effective change agents, make rational decisions (often on the basis of media evidence) and to communicate effectively perhaps through an active involvement with the media.” (1997, 60)

Institutions cannot be democratised without a thorough understanding of their values and practices. Another noted media scholar, Stuart Ewen, agrees with Masterman’s conceptualisation of the role of media literacy in democratisation and social progress.

“Media literacy cannot simply be seen as a vaccination against PR or other familiar strains of institutionalized guile. It must be understood as an education in techniques that can democratize the realm of public expression and will magnify the possibility of meaningful public interactions” (Ewen 1996, 414).

To be sure, some scholars do not attempt to conceal their contempt for what they see as the growing commercialisation and homogenisation of society. Ewen (2000) describes his story of his own personal awakening amid the growing hypercommercialism of the 1950s, suggesting that advertising in particular teaches homogenisation and creates a culture that is a comfortable womb for capitalism and consumption and little else. As a result, commercial values foster the weak political culture that gives rise to consumption and waste, rather than citizenship and democratic participation. To scholars like Ewen, these issues are fair game for critical media literacy.

Dyson (1998) agrees that corporate media are not held accountable for their inattention to issues of citizenship and democratic participation, and suggests that more attention should be “drawn to dated definitions of censorship and freedom of expression and how these are being exploited by corporate interests for the purpose of protecting unfettered freedom of enterprise, without any regard for the social and cultural fallout” (1998, 159). In Dyson’s view, the public at large must demand responsibility and better accountability from corporate media giants who are now free to use the public airwaves in whatever way

they choose.

“Consider. This is quite a remarkable exemption at a time when other industries are increasingly being held accountable for destruction of the natural environment” (*ibid.*).

Dyson demands better vigilance over the communications industry from already existing regulatory bodies established to function on behalf of the public interest. At the same time, she says, media literacy educators must be prepared to address both content and context:

“one without the other will leave us all endlessly spinning our wheels in quicksand while we continue to be seduced by economic imperatives” (1998, 165).

Many educators will be uncomfortable with some of these positions, and that is just fine. A variety of perspectives help to make a field vibrant, strong and ever growing. But decades of scholarship in media and communication—from cultural and critical studies and from social scientific approaches—can tell us a great deal about the news media landscape and our role in it as consumers and citizens. Let us not shy away from the large and growing body of work that can help individuals gain a clearer view of their world. Also, none of this is meant to suggest that, to understand media, one must have a graduate-level education in the political economy of media or in media theory and criticism. But a contextual approach to understanding media - especially news media - is vital to an open, inquiry-based, questioning perspective that is the essence of literacy.

News literacy and critical apathy: a warning

The critical, political economic perspective espoused by some of the scholars mentioned above is likely what Kovach and Rosenstiel were thinking of when they described media literacy as arising from a “left-leaning perspective that teaches how the media in all its forms manipulates us on behalf of commercial and establishment interests” (2010, 202). But media literacy is much larger than this narrow interpretation, and the breadth of perspectives included under the media literacy umbrella is the reason for the field’s success to date. Furthermore, there are reasons to believe that the “skeptical way of knowing” and the content-centred approach to news literacy espoused by Kovach and Rosenstiel is actually a potentially damaging attempt to engage citizens in news and civic life.

A growing number of scholars have asked the question, why have new media and the digital revolution not led to an increase in democracy? One possible answer is that even when we are armed with critical consumption habits, we are still fundamentally consumers, powerless to affect change. When we bring our savviness to media content alone, we engage only on a superficial level and fail to see or address the larger political or social contexts that prefer some types of content over others. Jan Teurlings, referencing Mark Andrejevic’s work on reality television, writes that the “savvy viewer is not duped but instead analyses and understands - often endlessly so - but sees no way in which things could be different” (Teurlings 2010, 368). It is one thing to possess the skills necessary to analyse content, to verify claims, to evaluate sources, but all too often this can leave the consumer in a powerless position where nothing can be done except continued consumption. Teurlings calls this a viewing position of “critical apathy,” which “engages our critical faculties, yet does so by directing us away from political action instead of towards it. It is, so to speak, the televisual equivalent of conspiracy theories: nothing is what it seems, everything is being manipulated, thus let us abolish politics” (368).

This is a valuable warning for proponents of a content-centred approach to news literacy that might leave us drowning in a sea of words and images with no critical faculties that might help us address the larger questions of how and why. Kovach and Rosenstiel write that they see news literacy as a subset of civic literacy, which helps us function in society:

“Civic literacy, in our minds, is a curriculum that would teach what we need to know

to function as citizens of a community. It is something beyond civics, something more engaged, more Socratic and more personal. News literacy is a subset of it” (2010, 209).

Indeed, “reading” the news is a key part of our ability to function as citizens, but that includes our ability to comprehend the structures and contexts that help shape and influence civic life. Kovach and Rosenstiel also write: “the real information gap in the twenty-first century is not who has access to the Internet and who does not. It is the gap between people who have the skills to create knowledge and those who are simply in a process of affirming preconceptions without ever growing and learning. It is the new gap between reason and superstition” (2010, 201). What better case could there be for examining the structures and contexts that shape our preconceptions and allow us to grow and learn?

And finally, it is arguably a more “political” approach to target content anyway, particularly in today’s polarised and highly-charged landscape. Teachers today are often scared of bringing media content into their classrooms at all for fear of being charged with political bias. As Renee Hobbs has said, “It’s likely that [teachers] have some anxiety, because the news climate right now is so polarized. It’s polarized in a way that you’re damned if you bring in CNN and you’re damned if you bring in Fox” (Jolly 2014). One way around this is to take a holistic approach to considering media systems and contexts. It is potentially less political to consider the system as a whole and the structure and arrangements of institutions within that whole. At least that way a teacher can avoid being branded with a certain political perspective from the moment they begin to speak.

Where to go from here

In 1998’s media literacy-themed issue of the *Journal of Communication*, Renee Hobbs wrote about the “seven great debates” in the then rapidly expanding field of media literacy and asked if the different approaches to the movement would help it succeed or lead to its downfall: “Does the wide diversity of perspectives among educators serve as a source of strength for the emerging media literacy movement, or does it suggest the essentially problematic nature of recent attempts to define and implement such an expansive and unstable concept as media literacy?” (Hobbs 1998, 16). Today media literacy is a well-established field, taught around the world in one form or another. It is even part of the new Common Core standards that have been widely embraced throughout the U.S. But debates about what to teach and how to teach it are ongoing even in the now well-established field of media literacy (see Potter 2010; Hobbs 2011; Ashley 2015). For a subject area as broad as media education, it is no surprise that there is no one-size-fits-all approach and that the field has been successful by being broadly inclusive of a variety of perspectives.

News literacy must now undergo this same process of considering a variety of perspectives from the many diverse interests who have a stake in how citizens understand and engage with news. Even the very notion of “news” is contested today by younger generations such as millennials, who have whole worlds of information at their fingertips unlike anything their parents have known. What constitutes news to young people looks different from what we might expect, and it remains to be seen how the concept of news will evolve in the coming years and decades. Young people today often maintain that if some piece of information is important, it will find them. If ever a mindset called for a contextual understanding of how news is made and disseminated, this is it.

For now, here are a few ideas for getting students to think contextually about how and why news is produced and disseminated:

Horse race coverage of elections. Any election is a good opportunity to look past political bias and focus on structural biases in the news: good narratives, good pictures, conflict frames, keeping the viewer’s attention (see Patterson 2013).

Filter bubbles. How do the online algorithms that disseminate information affect the con-

tent you see (see Pariser, 2012)?

The net neutrality debate. Consider the function of policymakers such as the FCC in determining the structure of the Internet (see Stiegler 2014).

Comparative cross-national study. Compare major outlets such as CNN, BBC and Al Jazeera. Consider different ownership and funding structures, different cultural influences and the possible effects on content (see Curran et al. 2009).

Campaign finance and free speech. Have students debate whether unlimited spending on political campaigns is a matter of free speech or should be regulated to ensure a balance of viewpoints (see Nichols and McChesney 2013).

Sponsored content and regulation of advertising. With the rise of paid posts in outlets from Buzzfeed to The New York Times, consider how and whether this fits with a journalistic mission and how regulatory bodies should treat this material (see Carlson 2015).

History of broadcasting. Arguably the most studied area of modern communication, the origins of broadcasting and the structure of early broadcasting systems in different countries, especially the U.S. and Britain, can illuminate news media contexts. How are these structures the same or different for the Internet today (see Barnouw 1966, Scannell and Cardiff 1991, McChesney 2013)?

As I noted at the outset, transferring the critical abilities of the journalist to ordinary citizens is a fine enterprise. But let's not forget that we all can have blind spots when it comes to how we do and see our own work. If we want to produce true critical thinkers, we must not stop at verification of claims and evaluation of sources. An astronomer can't find meaning in the stars without a foundation in physics. A jigsaw puzzle is much harder to complete without knowing what the end product is supposed to look like. And citizens cannot fully comprehend news messages without understanding how and why they exist - or fail to exist - in the broader media landscape. As Lewis and Jhally write, "although we see textual analysis as an integral part of media education, we suggest that in any media system, the reason why we see some messages and not others raises the question of power and the active construction of the social world" (1998, 109). This formulation is especially true of news and its role in constructing the social world.

I hope the current chapter of news literacy education is being written at the outset of a period of searching and inclusiveness, and I hope these comments are seen as a constructive urging to engage as wide a variety of viewpoints and perspectives as can be found. Like media literacy more broadly, news literacy will succeed on its ability to embrace a range of approaches and should not ignore or turn its back on decades of work by scholars, educators and practitioners that can help inform the current moment. News literacy is not so different from media literacy, as both fields seek to empower citizens to reach individualised goals as well as participate in democratic self-governance and civic life.

References

Ashley, S. 2015. "Media Literacy in Action? What Are We Teaching in Introductory College Media Studies Courses?" *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator* 70(2): 161-173.

Aufderheide, P., and C. Firestone. 1993. *Media Literacy: A Report of the National Leadership Conference on Media Literacy*. Queenstown, Md.: Aspen Institute.

Barnouw, E. 1966. *A Tower in Babel: A History of Broadcasting in the United States to 1933*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Carlson, M. 2015. "When News Sites Go Native: Redefining the Advertising-Editorial Di-

vide In Response To Native Advertising." *Journalism* 16(7): 849-865.

Christ, W.G., and J. W. Potter. 1998. "Media Literacy, Media Education, and the Academy." *Journal of Communication* 48 (1): 5-15.

Curran, J., Iyengar, S., Lund, A.B., and Salovaara-Moring, I. 2009. "Media System, Public Knowledge and Democracy: A Comparative Study." *European Journal of Communication* 24: 5-26.

Dyson, R. A. 1998. "Media literacy: Who Needs it and What Does It Mean?" *Gazette* 60 (2): 155-166.

Ewen, S. 1996. *PR! A Social History of Spin*. New York: BasicBooks.

———. 2000. "Memoirs of a Commodity Fetishist." *Mass Communication and Society* 3 (4): 439-452.

Hobbs, R. 1998. "The Seven Great Debates in the Media Literacy Movement." *Journal of Communication* 48 (1): 16-32.

———. 2008 "Debates and Challenges Facing New Literacies in the 21st century." In *International Handbook of Children, Media and Culture*, edited by S. Livingstone and K. Drotner, 431 - 447. London: Sage.

———. 2011. "The State of Media Literacy: A response to Potter." *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media* 55 (3): 419-430.

Jolly, J. 2014. "News Literacy vs. Media Literacy." *Columbia Journalism Review*. Accessed April 30, 2015. http://www.cjr.org/news_literacy/news_literacy_vs_media_literac.php.

Kellner, D., and J. Share. 2005 "Toward Critical Media Literacy: Core Concepts, Debates, Organizations, and Policy." *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 26 (3): 369-386.

Key Concepts of News Literacy (2015). Digital Resource Center. Center for News Literacy at Stony Brook University. Retrieved Dec. 14, 2015 from <http://drc.centerfornewsliteracy.org/key-concepts-news-literacy>.

Kovach, B., and T. Rosenstiel. 2010. *Blur: How to Know What's True in the Age of Information Overload*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Lewis, J., and S. Jhally. 1998. "The Struggle Over Media Literacy." *Journal of Communication* 48 (1): 109-120.

Malik, M., Cortesi, S., and Gasser, U. 2013. "The Challenges of Defining 'News Literacy'." Berkman Center for Internet & Society. Retrieved Dec. 14, 2015 from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2342313>.

Maksl, A., Ashley, S., and Craft, S. 2015. "Measuring News Media Literacy." *Journal of Media Literacy Education*, 6(3): 29-45.

Masterman, L. 1997. "A Rationale for Media Education." In *Media Literacy in the Information Age*, edited by R. Kubey, 15-68. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

McChesney, R. 2008. *The Political Economy of Media: Enduring Issues, Emerging Dilemmas*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

McChesney, R. 2013. *Digital Disconnect: How Capitalism is Turning the Internet Against Democracy*. New York: New Press.

Nichols, J., and McChesney, R. 2013. *Dollarocracy: How the Money and Media Election Complex is Destroying America*. New York: Nation Books.

Pariser, E. 2012. *The Filter Bubble: How the New Personalized Web Is Changing What We Read and How We Think*. New York: Penguin Books.

Patterson, T. 2013. *Informing the News: The Need for Knowledge-Based Journalism*. New York: Vintage.

Potter, W. J. 2004. *Theory of Media Literacy: A Cognitive Approach*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

———. 2010 “The State of Media Literacy.” *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media* 54 (4): 675-696.

Scannell, P., and Cardiff, D. 1991. *A Social History of British Broadcasting: 1922-1939 Serving the Nation, Volume 1*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Shoemaker, P. J., and T. P. Vos. 2009. *Gatekeeping Theory*. New York: Routledge.

Shoemaker, P. J., and S. D. Reese. 2013. *Mediating the Message in the 21st Century: A Media Sociology Perspective*, 3rd ed. New York: Routledge.

Stiegler, Z. (ed.) 2014. *Regulating the Web: Network Neutrality and the Fate of the Open Internet*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Teurlings, J. 2010. “Media Literacy and the Challenges of Contemporary Media Culture: On Savvy Viewers and Critical Apathy.” *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 13: 359-373.

Re-thinking news, re-thinking news literacy: a user-centred perspective on information

Katherine G. Fry, PhD, Brooklyn College of the City University of New York

The story about the March, 2015 Lufthansa jet crash in France at the hands of co-pilot Andreas Lubitz unfolded as I was preparing this article.

Three days after the crash I was tied to the Internet, feverishly accessing online newspapers, BBC radio news, and social media sites for information I could gather, speculate about and comment on. My preferred internet and radio sources, *The Guardian*, *The New York Times*, the BBC, and German newspapers *Bild* and *Berliner Zeitung*, among others, were updating as fast as they could, as were Twitter, Facebook, Yahoo, and Youtube, to name only a few. The tragedy and its mysterious nature cried out for explanation and more information. The always-on news cycle demanded it, and news organisations and participants in the social media stream churned it out as fast as they could.

Social media sites figured heavily in the information circulation about this crash, in the general social media whirl and in more traditionally prepared journalistic reports, both of which fed each other. Journalists embedded Twitter and Facebook postings from many different sources into their reports which were, in turn, re-posted on a host of other sites. Lubitz's Facebook page was repeatedly referenced, and by day three, as if on news cycle cue, Facebook was circulating links to posts from at least one blog about Lubitz's possible ties to Muslim extremism, though such information had not been included in the more mainstream news sites. I personally did not access Instagram or Youtube around this event, though doubtless they were included in the media mix for others.

As with most news and information circulation today - for events and issues tragic, banal, and somewhere in between - participation is the key driving concept. Around this tragedy I found myself participating in a routine of checking various sources, researching claims, using Facebook to write about and de-bunk what I considered un-credible sources of information, and commiserating about the tragedy while questioning the overall sense of it with my friends online. It was part of my own quest to sort through and add to the information mix in order to dispel rumor and champion some sort of “truth.” Through my participation I was clearly in a relationship with the entire stream of information about this tragedy.

The information swirl around this plane crash could be a good case study for understanding and examining news from the traditional academic theoretical perspectives of news values (Galander 2012), agenda-setting (Lee 2015), or news framing (Bruce 2014), perhaps within the current zeitgeist of terror threat or mental health issues in conjunction with previous major tragedies. But this event as circulated in the digital media sphere is also a prime example of how news is no longer a product of the traditional processes of journalism across legacy print and broadcast sources, and can no longer be examined in that way. Perhaps it should not be examined as its own separate genre at all.